



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/777,045	02/05/2001	Douglas J. Pogatzetz	8773/113	8697

7590

11/05/2003

Baniak Pine & Gannon
150 N. Wacker Drive
Suite 1200
Chicago, IL 60606

EXAMINER

WOOD, KIMBERLY T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3632

DATE MAILED: 11/05/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/777,045

Applicant(s)

POGATETZ ET AL.

Examiner

Kimberly T. Wood

Art Unit

3632

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 June 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 14-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 22-32 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 34-37 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12, 14-17, 33 and 38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 18-21 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 3632

This is the second office action for serial number 09/777,045, in response to Amendment A filed on June 30, 2003.

Election/Restrictions

This application contains claims 22-32 drawn to an invention nonelected without traverse in Paper Nos. 4 and 9. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

Allowable Subject Matter

The indicated allowability of claim 18 is withdrawn based on reconsideration of the Arnold and Frank. Rejections based on the cited reference(s) follow.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the

Art Unit: 3632

United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1, 2, 6-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Arnold et al. (Arnold) 5,141,196. Arnold discloses a bracket comprising a wall mounting portion (17), a personal computing appliance mounting portion (12) angled to the wall mounting portion (via notches 23 varying the angle (20 degrees)), a horizontal cross member (31), a plurality of mounting pads ("29" each pad contacts a top or upper section of the appliance on either side and the bottom or lower surface on either side), first and second flange members (the planar members 19 to the left and right of the opening 25) having at least one through opening including two openings (37 and since

Art Unit: 3632

it is a key-shaped slot opening it has one opening of a first diameter and a second opening of a second diameter).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arnold 5,141,196 in view of Wisniewski 6,382,580. Arnold discloses all of the limitations of the claimed invention except for the mounting pads having a concave body portion. Wisniewski discloses a bracket comprising a wall mounting portion (44a and 24), a personal computing appliance mounting portion (48) having two planar flanges (see figures 2 and 3 near element 44a) and two openings for each flange (44a), a plurality of mounting pads (4 mounting pads elements 36) having a concave body portion (where the pads are curved). The mounting pads can contact the sides of a computer on upper and

Art Unit: 3632

lower portions. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Arnold to have substituted the mounting pads for the concave mounting pads as taught by Wisniewski for the purpose of providing a more secure attachment to the personal computing appliance mounting portion thereby clamping the appliance via the mounting pads to the personal computing appliance mounting portion enabling a firm pressure-resistant retention of the computer as it is inserted into the mounting portion and the holder.

Claims 33 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arnold 5,141,196 in view of Wisniewski 6,382,580 in further view of Sullivan et al. (Sullivan) 5,542,314. Arnold in view of Wisniewski disclose all of the limitations of the claimed invention except for the flexible insulative mounting pads. Sullivan teaches that it is known to have flexible insulative mounting pads (76). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have modified Arnold in view of Wisniewski to have made the mounting pads of flexible insulative material (rubber) as taught by Sullivan for the purpose of providing a more gripping action when clamping the appliance to the mounting portion.

Claims 1-7 and 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frank et al. (Frank) 5,177,665 in view of Chang 5,214,574. Frank discloses a bracket apparatus

Art Unit: 3632

comprising a bracket including a wall mounting portion (10) comprising first and second planar flanges (14), horizontal cross member (the planar back member of 10 which extends between the triangular shaped flanges on the sides), a personal computing appliance mounting portion (10) having two planar flanges, a keyboard holder (8) being rotatably attached by a first rod member (12 pins are rods). Frank discloses all of the limitations of the claimed invention except for the horizontal cross member and mounting pads. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Frank to have modified Frank to have been made of Chang teaches that it is known to have an appliance mounting portion (16) and a keyboard mounting portion (14) comprising mounting pads in each portion (58). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Frank to have included the mounting pads to the corners of the appliance mounting portion and keyboard holder to enable a firm pressure-resistant retention of the computer as it is inserted into the mounting portion and the holder.

Claims 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frank et al. (Frank) 5,177,665 in view of Chang 5,214,574 in further view of Sullivan 5,542,314. disclose all of the limitations of the claimed invention except for the flexible insulative mounting pads. Sullivan teaches that it is

Art Unit: 3632

known to have flexible insulative mounting pads (76). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have modified Frank in view of Chang to have made the mounting pads of flexible insulative material (rubber) as taught by Sullivan for the purpose of providing a more gripping action when clamping the appliance to the mounting portion.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 18-21 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 34-37 are allowed.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kimberly Wood whose telephone number is (703) 308-0539. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:30 AM to 5:00 PM. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-2168. The fax number for an Official Amendment or Response is (703) 872-9326. The fax


Application/Control Number: 09/777,045

Page 8

Art Unit: 3632

number for an Official After Final Amendment or Response is
(703) 872-9327.

Kimberly Wood
Primary Examiner
November 3, 2003


KIMBERLY WOOD
PRIMARY EXAMINER